## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### 1.) Claim Status

Claims 11-18 are pending in the application. Claims 11 and 15 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### 2.) Request for Telephone Interview

This RCE is filed for the purpose of requesting a telephone interview to discuss the issues identified in paragraph 3) below. It is requested that Examiner Afolabi please contact the Applicants' attorney, Steven W. Smith, at (972) 583-1572 to set up a date and time for the interview.

### 3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On Page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained the obviousness rejection of claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Scholtens et al. (US 7,054,273) and Mimura, et al. (US 2001/0021176 A1). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Issue 1: Do the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed step of sending a seizure signal from the originating gateway to the destination gateway indicating (a) that a test is to be performed, (b) which interface to use for the test, and (c) a desired number of call handling resources to be used for the test?

Issue 2: Do the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed step of the destination gateway returning a resource ready acknowledgment signal to the originating gateway prior to the originating gateway configuring the reserved call resources for the test?

These limitations are recited in independent claims 11 and 15.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner ended his argument for maintaining the rejection by stating that the limitation, "the destination gateway returning a resource ready acknowledgment signal to the originating gateway prior to the originating gateway

configuring the reserved call resources for the test" is not recited in the claims. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 11 recites the step of receiving a resource ready acknowledgment signal in the originating gateway from the destination gateway, the acknowledgment signal indicating that the desired number of resources are available in the destination gateway. Claim 11 then recites that the call handling resources in the originating gateway are configured *in response to the acknowledgment signal from the destination gateway*. Therefore, the claim does clearly recite that the destination gateway returns a resource ready acknowledgment signal to the originating gateway prior to the originating gateway configuring the reserved call resources for the test.

Independent claim 15 also recites these features, which distinguish the claimed invention from the combination of Scholtens and Mimura.

# 4.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 11-18.

As noted above, the Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner disagrees. Please contact the Applicants' attorney below as soon as practicable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: JUNE 5, 2009

Steven W. Smith Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572 steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com

Amendment - PAGE 6 of 6 EUS/GJ/P/09-9118